

Glenn Labor-Management Partnership Meeting

October 18, 2000

Minutes

DRAFT

Attendees: George Madzsar, James Davis, Paivi Tripp, Bob Fails, Angel Pagan, Gwendolyn Davis, Larry Kalb, Jack Salzman, Hank Wroblewski, Bob Everett

Guest: William Spellacy, Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA) – Interest Based Bargaining Training

There were three agenda items for the meeting:

Define Retreat issue
Interest Based Bargaining Training
Potential Retreat Dates

Define Retreat Issue

There was much discussion regarding the retreat issue. Bob Fails indicated that his understanding was that the issue had been decided and that it would be the technicians. Larry Kalb expressed agreement. Jack Salzman stated that the scope should be more broad. There was general discussion regarding a process (i.e. use of skill mix, needs assessment). Jack discussed some strategic issue such as how the Center will use its opportunities, other issues such as use of secretaries and the IG issues, as well as the technician issue. He further stated that addressing the technician issue without addressing other issues could give a distorted view. He felt we must look at the Center as a whole. Jack indicated that he saw the Partnership involved in deciding what will happen with the workforce as a result of these decisions, (i.e. will people (technicians) be retrained? Will we rehire? What criteria will be used in making decisions?

Bill Spellacy stated that the issue we decide on must be something that can be accomplished. The product we come up with must be of value. Bill then began to attempt to gain a better understanding of what the Partnership want to accomplish and problems to be addressed. Bob Fails suggested that the Partnership develop a plan for dealing with the workforce resulting from decisions made.

The discussion of technicians continued. James Davis and Bob Everett explained the length of time it takes to bring technicians up to speed. George Madzsar explained that the situation is similar with S&E's. George, James, Bob Everett and Larry then got into a lengthy discussion regarding technician preparation. Paivi Tripp suggested that we get back to a discussion regarding the issue to be decided. Her recommendation was a scope that went beyond or was broader than the technicians.

George asked the question of how we would measure success. How we would deal with the DSMT, for example, not taking our recommendations in their deliberation process. He also reminded the Partnership that the programs were not represented at the table. Jack reiterated that the Partnership is looking at issues that affect the employees, not the programs. Bob Fails indicated that the DSMT was not that far along in the strategic planning process and that they would welcome recommendations from the Partnership. Bob Everett reminded us of the risk associated with taking on large issues and that we had never finished an issue. He stated that we had taken on issues that were too large and as a result never completed. Larry suggested a set of guidelines to ensure that employees are treated in a humane way, (e.g., RIF would be a last resort). George mentioned that the SMO Office would be holding a retreat to discuss strategic issues (programmatic). He indicated that the product the Partnership comes up with could be used as a part of this planning. Bill suggested that if this were the plan maybe some preliminary work would probably need to be done.

Decision: It was decided that the issue for the retreat would be to develop a process that will be used by Center planning teams (e.g., DSMT), in addressing concern and decisions affecting the workforce. Examples were realignment, downsizing, and budget cuts.

Bill suggested that rather than use the entire Partnership, use a small group (sub-committee) to do the preliminary work, collect information, and other consideration to get started. It was also suggested the team gather other useful information such as affect of past activities such as realignment and buyout. It was decided that the sub-committee would consist of Bob Fails, Larry Kalb, Bob Everett, and Lori Pietravoia.

Bill Spellacy suggested that we move to the last thing on the agenda “**Potential Retreat Dates**”. George mentioned that Mr. Campbell’s calendar was pretty much filled for the remainder of the year. **Action Item** - George was to look into the first two weeks in December. It was agreed that at least two days would be needed, with a goal of a finished product. James suggested that the sub-committee develop categories for the Partnership to discuss at the retreat.

Interest Based Bargaining Training – In consideration for the time Bill Spellacy gave an abbreviated version of the Interest Based Bargaining training. Handouts were provided attendees.

Adjourned 3:00p.m.